

Remarks

Entry of the above amendments is requested for the purpose of removing the grounds for the formal rejections in the first Office Action, and for distinguishing the claimed invention from the references cited and applied against the claims.

Regarding the formal objection to claim 9, the addition of dependent apparatus claims 6-8 has obviated this ground for objection.

With reference to the rejection of the originally presented claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by the disclosure of U.S. Patent No. 5,777,893 to Farrow et al. (the '893 Farrow reference), it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by the current claims is neither anticipated by, nor obvious over, the disclosure of the '893 Farrow reference for the following reasons. The Farrow '893 reference is directed to a vehicle detector system having a conventional inductive street loop 12 and circuitry for measuring loop inductance changes in response to vehicle movements. Farrow '893 discloses a loop check technique which functions by measuring minimum and maximum loop inductance values during vehicle detection and comparing these measured values with some (unspecified) standard to provide a shorted or open loop error indication.

In contrast, the invention as now defined by claim 1 provides an improved loop integrity testing technique which employs a separate check loop positioned adjacent the inductive loop in the roadbed. The check loop is periodically activated by the vehicle detector to simulate a vehicle load on the inductive loop, and the resulting measured inductance value can be compared with a threshold value to determine whether the inductive loop is functioning properly. Claim 1

expressly recites a separate check loop located adjacent the inductive loop, and switch means for selectively coupling the check loop to the vehicle detector. Farrow '893 neither teaches directly nor inherently suggests this combination of elements. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the disclosure of the Farrow '893 reference for this reason alone.

In addition, however, claim 1 further requires that the vehicle detector include means for periodically activating the switch means to couple the check loop to the vehicle detector, means for activating the check loop to simulate a vehicle load on the inductive loop when the check loop is coupled to the vehicle detector, and means for determining the inductance value of the inductive loop when the check loop is activated. This combination of positively recited elements is further absent from the Farrow '893 system. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is clearly patentable over the Farrow '893 reference disclosure.

Dependent claim 3 is directed to a multi channel vehicle detector having the loop check capability for each channel. Since Farrow '893 does not have elements for performing a loop check using a single separate check loop, this reference lacks the teaching of such elements for a multi channel vehicle detector. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is likewise patentable over the Farrow '893 reference disclosure.

Dependent claim 5 is directed to apparatus for performing an iterative loop integrity test using the separate check loop and the inductive loop. Since Farrow '893 does not teach circuitry for performing a simple loop integrity test using a separate check loop, it is respectfully submitted that this reference also lacks any teaching of an apparatus with such additional elements.

Dependent claims 6-8 expressly recite further elements for the performance of the iterative loop integrity test. It is respectfully submitted that Farrow '893 shows no such elements.

Method claim 9 is the method counterpart to apparatus claim 1 and is believed patentable over the disclosure of the '893 Farrow reference for the reasons advanced above. Similarly, dependent method claims 10-13, which are directed to the further iterative loop integrity test from a method standpoint, are believed to be patentable over the Farrow '893 for the reasons advanced above.

The remaining references have been carefully considered but are not seen to supply the deficiencies noted above with respect to the Farrow '893 reference

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case for issue.

If deemed useful in any further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 702-270-8853.

Accompanying this amendment is a notice of change of address. Please direct all future correspondence in this case to the new address.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Warren P. Kujawa".

Warren P. Kujawa

Reg. No. 25142